

## REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on November 28, 2003, in which claims 1-12 and 28-37 were allowed and in which claims 21-27 were rejected. With this response, claim 1 is amended to correct a typing error. The amendment to claim 1 is not made for the purposes of patentability and is non-narrowing. Independent claim 21 is also amended. Claims 1 through 37 are presented for reconsideration allowance.

### I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On December 10, 2003, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Prone and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of claim 21 was discussed. It was agreed upon that the above amendments to claim 21 would result in claim 21 overcoming rejections based upon the prior art and would place independent claim 21 as well as dependent claims 22-27 in condition for allowance. In particular, it was agreed upon that the prior art record fails to disclose tool recited in claim 21 additionally including a tear-off edge. It was further agreed upon that, in addition to placing the application in condition for allowance, the above amendments to claim 21 do not raise new issues with regard to the tear-off edge that had already been considered with respect to claim 1. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Prone for the opportunity to discuss the projection.

### II. Rejection of Claims 21 through 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Based Upon Mager and Martinez, et al.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejected claims 21 through 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mager, U. S. Patent No. 3,891,204 in view of Martinez, et al., with Patent No. 4,632,444. It was agreed upon during the Examiner Interview that neither Mager nor Martinez includes the recited tear-off edge in claim 21. Accordingly, independent claim 21, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Mager in view of Martinez. Claims 22 through 27 depend from claim 21 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 21, 2004

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER  
777 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 3800  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-5306  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276